

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-24 are currently pending.

According to the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0013163 A1 to O'Prey. Applicants have amended claim 1 to address the rejection. In particular, Applicants have amended claim 1 to state that reformatting the caller identification for use by the communication device by matching a format of the caller identification to one of the first format and the second format based on a one of the first communication network and second communication network used by the transceiver. In other words, claim 1 is selecting a format of a caller identification based on communication network used by the device's transceiver. The device is a dual mode device that can operate in either of the first communication network or the second communication network where the two networks may use different caller identification formats, which may not be compatible with one another. Thus, the present invention matches the caller identification to the correct format based on the network on which the device is operating. If the device is using the first communication network, for example, the caller identification will be matched to the format of the first communication network.

O'Prey is directed to a communication system for routing calls originating in a cellular communication network of the system. A cellular communications device appends a stored access code to a user-selected number and transmits the resulting modified number to the cellular communication network. The SIM card of the communications device receives a user-selected number from a controller of the cellular communications device, appends the stored access code to the selected number, and returns the modified number to the processor of the cellular communications device for transmission to the network. The call is then routed in dependence upon the appended access code.

O'Prey focuses on adding prefix numbers to a number stored during dialing. The prefix numbers are added by a device's SIM card. O'Prey disclosure is focused on

routing a call to a gateway switch independently of what a user has dialed. In contrast, the present invention, as is evident in claim 1, provides a communication device to analyze caller identifications based on the network type the transceiver is using. Accordingly, the communication device normalizes caller ID to look it up in a phone book stored in the device and modifies the caller identification to match the way data is stored in the phone book. Thus, claim 1 provides the ability to manipulate dial digits from the call identification based on which network the communication device is using or which number the user uses to dial the number.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that O'Prey does not disclose the present invention and does not disclose that the matching of a format for the caller identification to one of the first format and the second format is based on the one of the first communication network and the second communication network used by the device's transceiver. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by O'Prey as found in claim 1. Claims 2-7 and 9 depend upon and include the limitations of independent claim 1 so that these dependent claims are not anticipated by O'Prey for the same reasons as those given for claim 1. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 10-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey in view of United States Patent No. 6,052,451 to Boero et al. Applicant has amended independent claims 10 and 18 consistent with the amendment made to claim 1. Thus, claim 10 also matches the caller identification to one of the first caller identification and the second caller identification based on the one of the first communication network and the second communication network used by the controller. Likewise, claim 18 matches the caller identification to one of the first format and the second format from one of the first communication network and second communication network used by the wireless communication device. Boero was discussed in Applicant's previous response. Boero does not disclose a dual mode device. Boero therefore does not disclose any details regarding matching the caller identification based on the one of the first communication network and second communication network that is used by the device or the device's components, e.g. the controller.

The combination of O'Prey and Boero does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the present invention because there is no suggestion that the matching of caller identifications is based on the communication network used by a dual mode device as described for claims 1, 10 and 18. Claim 8 depends on claim 1 and is not obvious in view of O'Prey and Boero for the reasons given above for claim 1 and the differences given between the present invention and Boero. Independent claims 10 and 18 are not obvious over the cited combination for the same reasons, and as claims 11-17 and 19-24 depend on these independent claims they are also not obvious. Applicants therefore request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **50-2117**.

Respectfully submitted,
Belkin, Anatoly S., et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750